

**Maritime Archaeology Working Group (MARCH)
SBNMS, Scituate, MA
8:00 AM – 3:00 PM
16 December 2003**

Meeting Summary

Summary of Action Items

1. The meeting summary from the November meeting was approved.
2. Materials will be distributed to members and their alternatives.
3. All documents will have correct date and time stamp.
4. Bill Lee will consult with his constituents (draggers) and other groups and come up with an appropriate buffer zone (circle) around heritage sites for mobile fishing gear.
5. SBNMS will furnish the group with National Register and Landmark criteria at the next meeting.
6. SBNMS will develop a set of criteria for each level of sites and distribute material to the group at the next meeting.

Working Group Attendees

Name	Affiliation
Jerry Hill	SAC Member Chair
Ben Cowie-Haskell	SBNMS Team Lead
John Jensen	Mystic Seaport
Ivar Babb	National Undersea Research Center at UCONN
Dave Trubey (alternate For Victor Mastone)	MA Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources
Deborah Cramer	Conservation Community
Martina Duncan	Portland Harbor Museum
Anne Smrcina	SBNMS Education Coordinator
Bill Lee	Commercial Fishing Industry
Steve James	Recreational Diving Industry
Marcie Bilinski	Technical Diving Community

Working Group Members Absent

Bruce Terrell, National Marine Sanctuary Program Maritime Archaeologist
 Jeff Gray, Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary Manager
 David Robinson, Public Archaeology Lab, Inc.
 Don King, Gillnet (fixed gear) representative

Others Present

Deborah Marx, Rapporteur and SBNMS Maritime Archaeologist

Matthew Lawrence, SBNMS Maritime Archaeologist

WELCOME BY JERRY HILL

REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 1 BY BEN COWIE-HASKELL

- All members received the meeting summary from the last meeting and were given the opportunity to provide comments on them. The member's comments are as follows:
 - All fishing is not damaging heritage resources; only some types of fishing are damaging heritage resources. Traditional fishing MAY impact heritage resources.
 - Meeting summaries are not minutes they are summaries only
 - Fishing resources a major issue and the group might need to put a disclaimer on the documents (such as meeting summaries) that this is a "work in progress"
 - If the document's meanings are misunderstood it is up to the members to set the media/public straight and set the record correct
 - The members and the public need to be clear that the concerns from the last meeting were from public scoping and from member comments
 - Members feel that there needs to be a public relational campaign to say what the purpose of the working group meetings are present a positive outlook on how the meetings will benefit them to gain support in the community

ACTION: The meeting summary from the November meeting was approved.

REVIEW OF ADENGA FOR MEETING 2 BY BEN COWIE-HASKELL

- Ben Cowie-Haskell reviewed the meeting agenda and asked for any corrections to the roster to be made. The names of member's alternates were read to the group.

ACTION: Materials will be distributed to members and their alternatives.

PROBLEM CHARACTERIZATION REVIEW BY BEN COWIE-HASKELL

- Ben Cowie-Haskell reviewed all of the public scoping comments and additional concerns raised by the members during the last meeting. The members were then given the opportunity to add additional concerns to the list. (*New concerns from members are in italics*)

5.A Need for Inventory and Assessment and Comprehensive Characterization of Heritage Resources.

Concerns:

- There is a great value to inventorying maritime heritage sites. The public really does care about these sites and the value of them. SBNMS needs to identify these sites for the public benefit.*
- Is there money in the budget or funding to fulfill the inventory and assessment goals?*
 - Ben Cowie-Haskell responded that by the group making recommendations to SAC and then to the superintendent it shows the importance of inventory and

assesses maritime heritage sites. This show of support may lead to an increase in the budget for the MHR program at SBNMS.

-The general public values heritage resources. Heritage resources should be on equal footing with natural resources and be viewed in the same category. Heritage resources are not renewable and this means that a SBNMS has strong responsibilities to manage all these resources

-Any inventory needs to also engage a systematic maritime anthropological approach to identify and assess heritage resource sites. Understanding human use patterns to identify site locations. History of human use established for SBNMS.

-Fisherman, Divers, and others have artifacts recovered from SBNM; SBNMS should record the data to expand its inventory.

-Develop a program to document previously found artifacts that may be from the Sanctuary.

-SBNMS is not working fast enough to inventory resources before they are impacted and/or damaged.

-SBNMS is the sole entity responsible for heritage resource management within the sanctuary, however other agencies, such as the Army Corps of Engineers, could be involved in heritage resource management if a project under their jurisdiction is initiated in the sanctuary.

-Since heritage resources have received greater attention recently, some members of the public are concerned that SBNMS might give greater priority to heritage resources to the detriment of natural resources.

-The multibeam map is inadequate to identify all heritage resources within the sanctuary. SBNMS currently does not have a systematic method to investigate heritage resources that do not appear on the multibeam map.

-SBNMS currently does not have a systematic method to investigate prehistoric/Native American sites within the sanctuary.

-SBNMS may not wisely use the funds it possesses if it chooses to inventory/assess objects that are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. MARCH does not believe that resources will be wasted on this issue. Even seemingly unassociated objects can add up to tell about human history.

-What is the potential for prehistoric sites. Where are the historic shipping lanes and fishing grounds? (Human use patterns)

- What does SBNMS do with artifacts that have already been brought up by fishermen or divers? Is it SBNMS's responsibility to conserve them or do they partner with museums? (no education and outreach done to these groups)

Actions/Strategies:

-SBNMS should develop a comprehensive GIS inventory of cultural resources.

-SBNMS should develop an integrated and systematic program of archaeological research.

-SBNMS should develop a systematic program of historical research to characterize heritage resources that may be within the sanctuary.

-SBNMS should coordinate with researchers, divers, and fishermen to help identify heritage resources.

- SBNMS should review the mapping/technology document drafted at Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and consider incorporating its findings into the SBNMS Heritage Resource action plan.
- SBNMS should coordinate with Native American groups to help identify heritage resources.
- Collaborate with research partners to assure that the latest research tools are available to improve the inventory.*
- Inventory needs to analyze its terminology in gathering information (normalize terms for a better understanding of the resources)*
- SBNMS needs a geological and cultural approach to its inventory and assessment.*
- Collect information comprehensively to know what you have and know what you don't have with a consistent methodology and accepted practices.*
- Develop an oral history database*
- Develop partnerships to be on the forefront of technology*
- The inventory and assessment of non National Register sites should be done on a case by case basis but you need to study all wrecks to know whether one is historic or not.*
- Identify a strategy on the inventory and documentation of artifacts (old and new finds)*
 - Create a policy for advertising to divers and fishermen to turn over artifacts through education and outreach (this creates trust!)*
 - Create a new strategy in the action plan to deal with this issue because these artifacts are pieces of SBNMS's history*

5.B No plan for heritage resource management and protection

Concerns:

- NOAA has the statutory responsibility to preserve heritage resources under its jurisdiction.
- SCR management is Euro/American centric.
- Traditional fishing activities are damaging heritage resources. *MARCH would amend to "Traditional fishing activities have damaged and may continue to damage heritage resources."*
- Diving on heritage resources may degrade the integrity of sites and or damage sites.
- Will disclosing the locations of heritage resource sites cause increased degradation of those sites?
- Some potential heritage resources are also environmental hazards (MIT radioactive waste, munitions disposal areas)
- SBNMS should consider the historical usage of the sanctuary and maintain public access (cultural history includes fishing on the bank)
- SBNMS will use shipwrecks as a way to prevent fishing within the sanctuary.

Actions/Strategies:

- Coordinate with divers, fishermen, and researchers*
- SBNMS should consider regulation changes to better protect heritage resources.
- Diving on sites within the sanctuary should be regulated under a permitting process and/or a concession policy.

- SBNMS should release the coordinates of the *Portland* and other very high relief wrecks to commercial fisherman so that they can avoid entangling their gear and damaging the resource.
- SBNMS should clearly define its position on salvage and archaeological permitting.
- SBNMS should consult with Native American groups/ Tribal Preservation Officers to establish ownership of heritage resources and treaty rights.
- SBNMS should create a prioritized set of criteria describing differing levels of importance and the associated levels of protection needed to manage heritage resources.
- SBNMS should create “zones/restricted areas” around heritage resource sites to enhance their protection.
- The Sanctuary should develop a management plan that follows these steps:
 1. Inventory (discovery and recording the resources present)
 2. Evaluation (determine the resources scientific and public importance)
 3. Planning (determine how the resource would be most appropriately used)
 4. Protection (safeguarding the resource)
 5. Utilization (authorizing or otherwise accommodating the proper use)
 (Taken from: Cultural Resources: Problems Protecting and Preserving Federal Archaeological Resources. GAO: December 1987)

5.C Lack of Public Awareness/Interpretation of heritage resources

Concerns:

- SBNMS should educate divers and fisherman about artifact recovery laws
- SBNMS should attempt to gain the trust of users by action rather than statements.
- Promote program to document previously found artifacts that may be from the Sanctuary
- Currently many people do not know that SBNMS exists; heritage resources provide an opportunity to capture the public’s imagination and interest.
- Interest in heritage resources can be used to deliver a larger message of ocean stewardship.
- Public is interested in actively visiting the *Portland*. Can this be done without endangering the resource?
- User groups are unaware of heritage resource regulations that pertain to their activities.

Actions/Activities:

- Leverage knowledge of SBNMS natural resources to expand heritage resources awareness.
- Develop targeted outreach material for different user groups. (Commercial Fishing, Researchers, Recreational Fishing, Scuba Diving) Identify user groups and constituent organizations.
- Outreach programs for Native American and other user groups to preserve oral tradition about the sanctuary.
- Outreach programs for regional archeological societies.
- Decode SBNMS’s cultural landscape to reveal the human dimensions of the sanctuary’s past and present.
- Identify and prioritize a list of outreach targets.
- Promote a policy of education and outreach for the community on laws and regulations

- Record the oral history of user groups through an outreach program*
- Educate people on heritage resources through other means (ie. whale watching)*

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION I – DRAFT STRATEGIES

-Ben Cowie-Haskell presented draft strategies 1-5 to the working group members. See the amended draft strategies and actions for all corrections made by the working group members and SBNMS

ACTION: All documents will have correct date and time stamp.

STRATEGY 3 Additional comments and questions:

- Does recreational fishing impact wrecks?
- Can possible closures be changed in the future? Answer: Yes
- How many level 1 sites will there be?
- What will be the buffer zone around level 1 sites?
- Research on level 2 sites will be used to adjust this action plan in 5 years.
- The working group members had a debate on the level of risks associated with allowing fishing on historic shipwrecks and enforcement issues
- Some members feel that the percentage of area that would be closed in SBNMS is so small that is it worth it to protect heritage resources. Other members are concerned that the percentage area would become too big
- Assessment of wrecks (for placement in certain levels) will use the National Register criteria, National Landmark criteria, fragility, and memorial site status
- Closing off sites is taking away the public's freedom and addressing a problem that does not exist
- Museums have a conservation viewpoint on the issue. The public can experience it without touching it.
- Steve James gave the members a description of recreational bottom fishing techniques with a jig. He states that mid-water or surface hook and line fishing probably does not have an impact on shipwrecks. He feels that education is the key to enforcement.
- Ben Cowie Haskell pointed out, from an enforcement perspective that allowing some types of fishing presents a major challenge because of the difficulty of distinguishing between an allowed activity and a prohibited activity.

ACTION: Bill Lee will consult with his constituents (draggers) and come up with an appropriate buffer zone (circle) around heritage sites for mobile fishing gear

- Are buoying sites a possibility?
 - Taking into account depths, currents, and location makes it unlikely for a deep sites (over 120 feet)

ACTION: SBNMS will furnish the group with National Register and Landmark criteria at the next meeting.

ACTION: SBNMS will develop a set of criteria for each level of sites and distribute to group at the next meeting.

How will sites be determined eligible for level 1 status?

- What type of assessment process?
- Who will it be done by? A board? The public?

-For level 2 sites draggers need to know location to avoid it. Release coordinates to a select subset of people who need the information.

-Level 4 sites can protect other sites because SBNMS can publicize and promote activities such as diving on the sites.

STRATEGY 4 Additional comments and questions:

- Add activity E to the list: foster partnerships with other maritime heritage related organizations
- Give seminars to groups such as whale watch charters to educate them
- Identify types of partners and constituents and develop marketing strategies for each group

CLOSING REMARKS BY JERRY HILL

Gerry E. Studds **Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary**
Management Plan Review

Maritime Archaeology Working Group – Agenda for Meeting 2

Date: 16 December 2003
Location: Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary
175 Edward Foster Rd.
Scituate, MA02066
781-545-8026

TIME	TOPICS AND OBJECTIVES
8:00-8:15	<p>•Welcome</p> <p>Discussion Leader: Jerry Hill</p>
8:15-9:00	<p>•Review and Adoption of Minutes from Meeting 1</p> <p>•Review of Agenda for Meeting 2</p> <p>Objective: Working group members are reminded about what happened during meeting 1 and the plan for meeting 2</p> <p>Discussion Leader: Ben Cowie-Haskell</p>
9:00-9:30	<p>• Problem Characterization Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Review Public Scoping Comments -Review Additional Comments from Meeting 1 <p>Objective: Familiarize working group members with all previously identified SBNMS Maritime Heritage Resources comments</p> <p>Discussion Leader: Ben Cowie-Haskell</p>
9:30-9:45	<p>•Break</p>
9:45-10:15	<p>• Formulating an Action Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review What is an Action Plan? - Review the sample action plan from California <p>Objective: Review what an action plan is made up of and its format.</p> <p>Discussion Leader: Ben Cowie-Haskell</p>
10:15-12:15	<p>•Round Table Discussion Part I – Draft Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Go over strategies 1-4 drawn up by SBNMS -Do they reflect all of the public scoping comments and MARCH concerns? - If not, address new concerns from the group and formulate and/or change draft strategies -Prioritize strategies <p>Objective: Develop strategies that reflect all the constituents concerns</p>

	Discussion Leader: Ben Cowie-Haskell
12:15-12:45	• Lunch
12:45-1:45	<p>• Round Table Discussion Part II – Strategies 1 and 2 -Determine Possible Actions for each Strategy</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Create a list of Actions for Each Strategy</p> <p>Discussion Leader: Ben Cowie-Haskell</p>
1:45-2:45	<p>• Round Table Discussion Part III – Strategies 3 and 4 -Determine Possible Actions for each Strategy</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Create a list of Actions for Each Strategy</p> <p>Discussion Leader: Ben Cowie-Haskell</p>
2:45-3:00	<p>•Summary and Next Steps - Do We Need to Meet in January?</p> <p>Discussion Leader: Jerry Hill</p>